

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 5-6 are canceled. Claims 1-4, and 7-69 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-16, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,904) in view of Zenith (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,771) and further in view of Otani (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,011). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

For example, claim 1 as amended calls for:

a display unit operable to display a user list identifying a plurality of users of said client device, to receive a user-entered password when a given one of the plurality of users is selected, and when the user-entered password is verified as corresponding to one stored in association with the given one of the plurality of users, to display content based on the received content data, to display a plurality of icon buttons associated with the plurality of icons such that a given one of the plurality of icon buttons represents a particular one of the plurality of icons, and to display a plurality of visual clues associated with a plurality of members of a buddy list associated with that user such that a given one of the plurality of visual clues is associated with a specific one of the plurality of members of the buddy list and indicates an on-line status of a client device associated with that member, the plurality of visual clues being smaller than a depiction of the plurality of members of the buddy list, said display unit being operable to display the depiction of the plurality of members of the buddy list in place of the plurality of visual clues[.] (Emphasis added.)

None of the relied-on sections of Cooper, the relied-on sections of Zenith, or the relied-on sections of Otani disclose or suggest receiving a user-entered password when a given one of a plurality of users is selected, and none of the relied-on

sections of these references disclose or suggest that a user-entered password is verified as corresponding to one stored in association with a given one of a plurality of users.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Cooper as modified by Zenith fail to explicitly teach verifying a selected user" but contends that "the Otani reference [teaches] an access administration method and device to provide access administration services ... and further teaches verifying selected user(s)." However, the sections of Otani that are relied on by the Examiner are not concerned with receiving a user-entered password and are not concerned with verifying a user-entered password. Therefore, the relied-on sections of Otani do not disclose or suggest these features.

It follows that neither the relied-on sections of Cooper, the relied-on sections of Zenith, nor the relied-on sections of Otani, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the method set out in claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 2-4, 7-16, and 21-23 depend from claim 1 and thus are distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 24-27, 36-56, and 67-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith. Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Independent claim 24 and independent claim 50 have each been amended to include limitations similar to those of emphasized above in the excerpt of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 24 and 50 are each patentably distinct and unobvious over Cooper and Zenith.

Claims 25-27 and 36-49 depend from claim 24, and claims 51-56 and 67-69 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of

these claims is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as its parent claim.

The Examiner also rejected claims 28-35, and 57-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of DeWeese (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0262542). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 28-35 depend from claim 24, and claims 57-66 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of claims 28-35 and 57-66 is distinguishable over Cooper and Zenith for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends. The DeWeese publication does not remedy these deficiencies.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of Otani (as applied to claim 15) and DeWeese. Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 1, and each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over Cooper, Zenith and Otani at least for the same reasons as claim 1. The DeWeese publication does not remedy these deficiencies.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner

might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

723323_1.DOC